

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HAROLD HOLCOMB,
Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL D. OVERMYER,
SUPERINTENDENT SCI-FOREST, et al.,
Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 15-5776

FILED

SEP 29 2016

LUCY V. CHIN, Interim Clerk
By _____ Dep. Clerk

ORDER

AND NOW, this 28th day of September, 2016, upon careful and

independent consideration of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus, the response to the petition and appended exhibits, and Petitioner's brief in support, and after review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge David R. Strawbridge, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;
2. The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is **DENIED AND DISMISSED**;
3. A certificate of appealability **SHALL NOT** issue, in that the Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right nor demonstrated that reasonable jurists would debate the correctness of the procedural aspects of this ruling. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); and
4. The Clerk of the Court shall mark this case **CLOSED** for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:


WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.